



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1998

No. 16

## Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Dr. David Burr, Pastor Emeritus, First Presbyterian Church, Winston-Salem, NC. Incidentally, he is the father of Congressman RICHARD BURR. We are very pleased to have you with us.

### PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, Dr. David Burr, Pastor Emeritus, First Presbyterian Church, Winston-Salem, NC, offered the following prayer:

May I remind ladies and gentlemen, today there will be an eclipse of the Sun in the United States. We are always praying for light.

Let us bow our heads before Almighty God.

O God of light, the giver of every good and perfect gift. Our prayer today is that You will break through the darkness of our lives; that You will shatter the barriers of our blindness with the splendor of Your wisdom and presence.

In the beginning, You created the light that leads to green pastures and still waters; You gave us the wisdom to walk in truth and to live in peace with one another.

But, Father, we confess that our minds and hearts are so limited to our selfish ways, that we do not always heed that light. We confess that sometimes we prefer to linger in the shadows and in the darkness.

But make today the beginning of a new adventure for our lives and for the Senate of the United States. Guide us in all our ways and flood this place with the splendor of Your light.

And we will rejoice and we will give praise to you forever and ever. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

### GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first, I compliment our guest Chaplain for a beautiful prayer, a wonderful way to start the day. I hope this body will have its Chamber flooded with the light of our Lord. So, thank you very much for a great opening.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this morning there will be 1 hour for morning business to be followed by two consecutive cloture votes. The first cloture vote will be on the McCain-Feingold amendment and will begin at approximately 11 a.m., to be followed by a cloture vote on the underlying bill, S. 1663. Following those two votes, Members can anticipate a period for morning business for Senators to make statements and introduce legislation. It is hoped later this afternoon that the Senate will be able to begin consideration of the ISTEAL legislation, the highway bill. Subsequently, additional rollcall votes are possible this afternoon. As a reminder to all Members, there will be two back-to-back rollcall votes at approximately 11 a.m. this morning.

### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators have until 11 a.m. in order to file second-degree amendments as under section 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. I yield the floor.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11 a.m., with the time for debate to be equally divided and controlled by the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Thank you, Mr. President.

### TRIBUTE TO DR. DAVID BURR, GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, it is a distinct pleasure for me this morning to introduce our guest Chaplain and to say a few words about him, a fellow North Carolinian and really the State's most distinguished minister, Dr. David Burr.

It is also an honor to welcome his son and my colleague, Congressman RICHARD BURR, who has also become a leader in the Congress of this country. He serves the fifth district of North Carolina, which is pretty much centered on Winston-Salem. We welcome Congressman BURR and his family.

Dr. Burr was educated at the University of Wisconsin and Princeton Theological Seminary. He received a Doctor of Divinity from Davidson College. In 1963, Dr. Burr came to Winston-Salem, NC, where he began and continued a long career serving the people of Forsyth County, and I mean all the people of Forsyth County, not just

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S1035

those limited to his First Presbyterian Church. He was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Winston-Salem for over 25 years, but his ministry went far beyond the church in which he was the assigned minister. He was literally Forsyth County's minister.

He is widely respected in North Carolina, and it is a distinct honor for me to welcome him to the Senate and it is an honor for all of us to have him here. Dr. Burr, we thank you for all you have meant to North Carolina. Thank you.

Mr. HELMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I join Senator FAIRCLOTH in extending our welcome and our appreciation to our distinguished guest Chaplain. I congratulate his son, Congressman BURR, for choosing such a fine father. I congratulate you, Dr. Burr, for having lucked out in having such a fine son. It is a pleasure to have you with us, and I hope you will come again, soon.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I join my colleagues and friends from North Carolina to not only congratulate the guest Chaplain but also his son, who is an outstanding leader in the House of Representatives.

#### VOLUNTARY CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, we are going to have two votes at 11 o'clock on campaign finance. One will be on the so-called McCain-Feingold amendment, as amended by the Snowe amendment yesterday, and the other one will be on the underlying bill that is called the Paycheck Protection Act. That is my bill. Maybe I misnamed the bill. Maybe I should have called it voluntary campaign contributions. I am going to speak on that just for a moment.

Mr. President, we are talking about campaign reform. I see there are charts on the floor—money is exploding, we need to ban soft money, we need to have more regulations of campaigns. I will tell my colleagues, I am willing to support campaign reforms, and maybe we can come up with different things we might be able to agree on, but I think a fundamental principle should be agreed upon at the outset, and that principle is this: No American should be compelled to contribute to a campaign against their will. No American. It is a fundamental principle.

We want to encourage people to contribute to campaigns, we want to encourage people to participate in the election process, but no one should be compelled to give. No one should have money taken out of their paycheck every month—against their will—to fund candidates who they don't agree with or to fund a philosophy that they are opposed to. Unfortunately, that

happens today, and it happens today to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Some of my colleagues have irritated me and almost impugned the integrity of Senators—in violation of the rules of the Senate that, incidentally, go all the way back to Thomas Jefferson. They said the purpose of this bill is a killer bill because anybody who supports that bill wants to kill campaign reform.

I am the author of that bill, and I take very strong exception to that statement. Granted, the New York Times said it, but the New York Times doesn't know this Senator. I am the author of that bill, and I sponsored this bill because a union member came to a town meeting in Owasso, OK, raised his hand and said, "I don't like my money being taken from me every month and being used for political purposes of which I totally disagree. I want to have a voice, I want to have a vote, and if they ask me, I would say no."

I told that person at that town meeting that I was going to work to make sure that his campaign contributions would be voluntary, and that is the purpose of this bill. It was not designed to kill McCain-Feingold. It was not designed to kill campaign reform.

I have stated time and time again, I am willing to try and work out a decent campaign reform bill, but it must be premised on voluntary contributions. That is fundamental. It is a basic American freedom, no one should be compelled or coerced to contribute to a campaign against their will. No one.

No one should be compelled to contribute to a campaign, period. It should be against the law. All we say in our bill is that all campaign contributions must be voluntary. Before money is taken out of a person's paycheck, he or she has to say yes. If they say no, it means no. After all, it is their money. It is not the union's money or somebody else's money; it is the individual's money.

Unfortunately, that is the situation today for millions of Americans. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. There is a movement growing out in the States, and there is going to be a vote on an initiative in California to protect workers paychecks and ensure all contributions are voluntary. It is also happening in many other States. It should happen all across the country. Frankly, we should do it on the Federal level, because we regulate Federal elections; we protect the freedoms of all Americans. This is supposed to be the body that protects the United States Constitution.

How in the world did we even allow a system to start where someone can be compelled to contribute to a political campaign or cause against their will? That is wrong, we ought to fix it, and the way to fix it is to support the underlying bill.

I say vote against the McCain-Feingold amendment. Why? Because McCain-Feingold did not say in addi-

tion to the underlying bill they want to add the following. It said strike the voluntary contribution language, strike that language, and replace it with McCain-Feingold. McCain-Feingold eliminates soft money. Soft money is at least done voluntarily. They want to end soft money contributions but they want to continue to have forced campaign contributions from union members.

The language we drafted in this bill said it would be voluntary for employees of banks, it would be voluntary for employees of corporations, it would be voluntary for all employees—all employees. McCain-Feingold doesn't say, "Well, we'll take that language and we'll add to it." No, it says strike that language. McCain-Feingold is the killer. It says, "We don't want voluntary contributions but we will try and micromanage campaigns and what people can say in elections."

Some of those things in McCain-Feingold are pretty debatable on constitutional grounds. The Senator from Kentucky has done a good job in handling that debate. I want to say that all campaign contributions should be voluntary.

This is not an anti-union member provision. There is nothing further from the truth. This is a proworker bill. This allows every single member of a union to say yes or no to campaign contributions. It gives them a voice. There are millions of union members who get up every day and work hard, pay their taxes and union dues, and are rewarded with a gag order over how those dues—their wages—are spent on politics. That is not right.

If you go to a union hall and ask a bunch of union members, "Hey, do you think you should have the choice to be able to say whether or not your money goes for campaign contributions or not?" they will say, "Yes, I want that right."

Let's give them that right. That is not anti-union, it is prounion worker.

Unfortunately, some people say, "Oh, no, that's wrong; that's a killer bill; that is going to stop campaign reform." Why? Why is that a killer bill? Because organized labor bosses don't like it? Since when do they have a veto over this body? Since when do organized labor bosses say, "Wait a minute, we don't think campaign contributions should be voluntary. So if you adopt the Nickles-Lott bill for paycheck protection—voluntary campaign contributions—we don't have a bill." Why? Because President Clinton says he will veto it? Why? Because a few leaders in organized labor don't like it? Why? Because organized labor bosses put in hundreds of millions of dollars in campaigns for the Democratic Party? Do they have a blank check veto over this body, over this Congress? Why, I should hope not. I would hope that one group cannot just say, "Well, we don't like that bill. Therefore, if you add to that bill, no deal." And that is basically what is happening.